

# Audit



# Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

**DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE  
BUDGET DATA FOR REALIGNING ELEMENTS OF  
HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,  
TO THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD**

Report No. 96-131

May 28, 1996

19991202 152

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

**Department of Defense**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**

Approved for Public Release

Distribution Unlimited

ARJ0003 0603

### **Additional Copies**

To obtain additional copies of this audit report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit of the Analysis, Planning, and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or FAX (703) 604-8932.

### **Suggestions for Audits**

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch of the Analysis, Planning, and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8939 (DSN 664-8939) or FAX (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)  
Inspector General, Department of Defense  
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)  
Arlington, Virginia 22202-2884

### **Defense Hotline**

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, contact the Defense Hotline by calling (800) 424-9098; by sending an electronic message to [Hotline@DODIG.OSD.MIL](mailto:Hotline@DODIG.OSD.MIL); or by writing the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

### **Acronyms**

BRAC  
MILCON

Base Realignment and Closure  
Military Construction



**INSPECTOR GENERAL**  
**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**  
**400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE**  
**ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884**



May 28, 1996

**MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)**  
**ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (FINANCIAL**  
**MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)**

**SUBJECT: Audit Report on Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for**  
**Realigning Elements of Headquarters, Department of the Navy, to the**  
**Washington Navy Yard (Report No. 96-131)**

We are providing this audit report for your review and comment. This report is one in a series of reports about FY 1997 Defense base realignment and closure military construction costs. Management comments on a draft of this report were considered in preparing the final report.

Management comments on the draft report conformed to the requirements of DoD Directive 7650.3. Therefore, no additional comments are required.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. Questions on the audit should be directed to Ms. Kimberley A. Caprio, Audit Program Director, at (703) 604-9248 (DSN 664-9248) or Mr. Kent E. Shaw, Audit Project Manager, at (703) 604-9228 (DSN 664-9228). See Appendix G for the report distribution. The audit team members are listed inside the back cover.

*David K. Steensma*

David K. Steensma  
Deputy Assistant Inspector General  
for Auditing

## Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 96-131  
(Project No. 6CG-5001.41)

May 28, 1996

### **Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Realigning Elements of Headquarters, Department of the Navy, to the Washington Navy Yard**

#### **Executive Summary**

**Introduction.** This report is one in a series of reports about FY 1997 Defense base realignment and closure military construction costs. Public Law 102-190, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993," December 5, 1991, directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the amount of the authorization that DoD requested for each military construction project associated with Defense base realignment and closure does not exceed the original estimated cost provided to the Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment (the Commission). If the requested budget amounts exceed the original project cost estimates provided to the Commission, the Secretary of Defense is required to explain to Congress the reasons for the differences. The Office of the Inspector General, DoD, is required to review each Defense base realignment and closure military construction project for which a significant difference exists from the original cost estimate and to provide the results of the review to the congressional Defense committees. Our audits include all projects valued at more than \$1 million.

**Audit Objectives.** The overall audit objective was to determine the accuracy of Defense base realignment and closure military construction budget data. This report provides the results of the audit of one project, valued at \$2 million, for the relocation of functional areas of the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy and the Under Secretary of the Navy from leased space in the National Capital Region to Government-owned space within the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

**Audit Results.** The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake, located at the Washington Navy Yard, overestimated its space requirements for building renovation and did not substantiate the cost per square meter for personnel transfer and building renovation on the submitted DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data." As a result, the Navy overstated cost estimates for project P-001T, "Headquarters Building Renovation."

See Part I for a discussion of the audit results. See Appendix E for a summary of invalid and partially valid requirements for the project we reviewed.

**Summary of Recommendations.** We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) place project P-001T on administrative withhold. We also recommend that the Navy submit a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data," that accurately reflects required size and contains a supportable estimated cost per square meter for the project.

**Management Comments.** The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) concurred with the report and stated that funds will be placed on administrative withhold if the issue is not resolved by the start of the fiscal year. The Navy concurred with the draft audit recommendations, and will resubmit a DD Form 1391 that accurately reflects the Defense base realignment and closure requirements for accommodating transferring personnel. See Part I for a summary of management comments, and see Part III for the complete text of management comments.

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Part I - Audit Results</b>	
Audit Background	2
Audit Objectives	2
Headquarters Building Renovation	4
<b>Part II - Additional Information</b>	
Appendix A. Scope and Methodology	8
Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews	9
Appendix C. Background of Defense Base Realignment and Closure and Scope of the Audit of FY 1997 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Costs	11
Appendix D. Other Matters of Interest	13
Appendix E. Projects Identified as Invalid or Partially Valid	14
Appendix F. Organizations Visited or Contacted	15
Appendix G. Report Distribution	16
<b>Part III - Management Comments</b>	
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments	20
Department of the Navy Comments	21

## **Part I - Audit Results**

### Audit Background

The Office of the Inspector General, DoD, is performing various audits of the Defense base realignment and closure (BRAC) process. This report is one in a series of reports about FY 1997 BRAC military construction (MILCON) costs. For additional information on the BRAC process and the overall scope of the audit of BRAC MILCON costs, see Appendix C. See Appendix E for a summary of invalid and partially valid requirements for the project we reviewed.

### Audit Objectives

The overall audit objective was to determine the accuracy of BRAC MILCON budget data. The specific objectives were to determine whether the proposed project was a valid BRAC requirement, whether the decision for MILCON was supported with required documentation including an economic analysis, and whether the economic analysis considered existing facilities. Another objective was to assess the adequacy of the management control program as it applied to the overall audit objective. The management control program objective will be discussed in a summary report on FY 1997 Defense base realignment and closure military construction budget data.

This report provides the results of the audit of project P-001T, "Headquarters Building Renovation," valued at \$2 million, resulting from the relocation of various Navy organizations from leased office space to Government-owned office space at the Washington Navy Yard.

The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake, located at the Washington Navy Yard, developed the requirements for project P-001. Those organizations that were to be moved included:

- o Office of Financial Management Operations, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller);
- o Office of Safety and Survivability, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment);
- o Office of Acquisition and Business Management, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development, and Acquisition);
- o Directorate of Acquisition Career Management, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development, and Acquisition);
- o Naval Council of Personnel Boards;



- o Office of General Counsel (Litigation);
- o Office of General Counsel (Management);
- o Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, Under Secretary of the Navy; and
- o Office of Total Quality Leadership, Under Secretary of the Navy.

See Appendix A for a discussion of the scope and methodology, Appendix B for a summary of prior coverage related to the audit objectives, and Appendix D for discussion of an economic analysis.

---

## **Headquarters Building Renovation**

The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake overestimated space requirements and did not substantiate the costs per square meter submitted on the DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data," for project, P-001T, "Headquarters Building Renovation." That happened because the Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake did not follow Navy instructions for space allocation to determine space required for accommodating personnel transferred to the Washington Navy Yard. The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake officials stated that they could not develop an accurate estimate of personnel transferring because other BRAC MILCON projects that moved personnel within the National Capital Region impacted the project. As a result, the Navy overstated cost estimates for the project.

### **Proposed Project for Headquarters Building Renovation**

In the DD Form 1391 for project P-001T submitted to Congress, the Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake, located at the Washington Navy Yard, proposed the renovation of existing administrative spaces to accommodate various Navy organizations that are currently located in leased space. The Navy submitted a DD Form 1391 for renovation of 8,826 square meters (about 95,000 square feet) of space in a building at the Washington Navy Yard, estimated to cost \$2 million.

### **Space Requirements**

The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake overestimated space requirements for project P-001T. The overestimate resulted because the Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake did not follow the Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5910.7A (Instruction 5910.7A), "Space and Facilities Management Procedures, National Capital Region (NCR)," April 22, 1993, when determining its space requirements. Instruction 5910.7A space allocation criteria apply to all Navy organizations that occupy Government-owned or commercial space in the National Capital Region. The instruction contains criteria for estimating office space requirements based on the number of personnel and their grades, ranks, or positions.

When preparing the DD Form 1391, the Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake officials did not have documentation to substantiate the number of personnel transferring to the Washington Navy Yard. Nevertheless, they submitted the DD Form 1391, without the necessary information. The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake officials stated that they could not develop an accurate estimate of personnel transferring because other BRAC MILCON projects that

moved personnel within the National Capital Region impacted the project. The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake should obtain necessary documentation to support the number of personnel to be accommodated for project P-001T. Once the data are obtained, the Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake should revise its estimates to accurately reflect the number of personnel transferring, in accordance with Instruction 5910.7A.

### **Cost Requirements**

The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake was not able to support its estimated cost per square meter (\$205) for the MILCON project. The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake stated that \$205 per square meter was an educated guess of the cost of the project. The estimated cost needs to be supported by historical costs of prior similar projects, architectural estimates, or by using cost estimating procedures provided by the Military Handbook 1010A, "Cost Engineering: Policy and Procedures," August 1, 1992. Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake needs to obtain historical data and establish supportable cost estimates.

### **Reducing Project Scope and Cost**

As a result of not adhering to Instruction 5910.7A, the Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake overstated cost estimates for the personnel transferring to the Washington Navy Yard. Therefore, the headquarters building renovation project for \$2 million should be placed on administrative withhold until the Navy submits a revised DD Form 1391 that accurately reflects required size and contains a supportable estimated cost per square meter for the project.

## **Recommendations, Management Comments, and Audit Response**

**1. We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) place project P-001T, "Headquarters Building Renovation," on administrative withhold until the Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake submits a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Program," that accurately reflects requirements and costs.**

**Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments.** The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) concurred with the recommendation. As a result, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) agreed to place FY 1997 funds on administrative withhold if the issue is not resolved at the start of the fiscal year, and reprogram the savings to support other valid Defense base realignment and closure requirements.

**2. We recommend that the Commander, Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake, submit a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Program," for project P-001T, "Headquarters Building Renovation," that reflects accurately the Defense base realignment and closure requirements for accommodating transferring personnel as set forth in Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5910.7A, "Space and Facilities Management Procedures, National Capital Region (NCR)," April 22, 1993, and includes costs per square meter that are supportable by historical data, architectural data, or the Military Handbook 1010A, "Cost Engineering: Policy and Procedures," August 1, 1992.**

**Navy Comments.** The Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment) concurred with the recommendation. A revised DD Form 1391 will be submitted and will accurately reflect Defense base realignment and closure requirements for accommodating transferring personnel.

## **Part II - Additional Information**

---

## Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

**Scope of This Audit.** We examined the FY 1997 BRAC MILCON budget request and supporting documentation for space requirements for one realignment project resulting from the relocation of various elements of Headquarters, Department of the Navy, from leased office space to office space in the Washington Navy Yard. Project P-001T, "Headquarters Building Renovation," is valued at \$2 million.

**Audit Period, Standards, and Locations.** This economy and efficiency audit was performed from February through March 1996 in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. The audit did not rely on computer-processed data or statistical sampling procedures. Appendix F lists the organizations visited or contacted during the audit.

---

## Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Since 1991, numerous audit reports have addressed DoD BRAC issues. This appendix lists the summary reports for the audits of BRAC budget data for FYs 1992 through 1996 and BRAC audit reports published since the summary reports.

### Inspector General, DoD

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
96-119	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Construction of a Multiple Purpose Facility at Fort McCoy, Wisconsin	May 14, 1996
96-118	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Medical and Dental Clinic Expansion Project at Naval Weapons Station Charleston, South Carolina	May 13, 1996
96-116	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Relocation of Deployable Medical Systems to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah	May 10, 1996
96-112	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Air Station Cecil Field, Florida, and Realignment of the Aviation Physiology Training Unit to Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida	May 7, 1996
96-108	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	May 6, 1996
96-104	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Construction of the Overwater Antenna Test Range Facility at Newport, Rhode Island	April 26, 1996

## Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

---

### Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
96-101	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Air Station Barbers Point, Hawaii, and Realignment of P-3 Aircraft Squadrons to Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Washington	April 26, 1996
96-093	Summary Report on the Audit of Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for FYs 1995 and 1996	April 3, 1996
94-040	Summary Report on the Audit of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Budget Data for FYs 1993 and 1994	February 14, 1994
93-100	Summary Report on the Audit of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Budget Data for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993	May 25, 1993



---

## **Appendix C. Background of Defense Base Realignment and Closure and Scope of the Audit of FY 1997 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Costs**

**Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment.** On May 3, 1988, the Secretary of Defense chartered the Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment (the Commission) to recommend military installations for realignment and closure. Congress passed Public Law 100-526, "Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act," October 24, 1988, which enacted the Commission's recommendations. The law also established the Defense Base Closure Account to fund any necessary facility renovation or MILCON projects associated with BRAC. Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990," November 5, 1990, reestablished the Commission. The law also chartered the Commission to meet during calendar years 1991, 1993, and 1995 to verify that the process for realigning and closing military installations was timely and independent. In addition, the law stipulates that realignment and closure actions must be completed within 6 years after the President transmits the recommendations to Congress.

**Required Defense Reviews of BRAC Estimates.** Public Law 102-190, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993," December 5, 1991, states that the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the authorization amount that DoD requested for each MILCON project associated with BRAC actions does not exceed the original estimated cost provided to the Commission. Public Law 102-190 also states that the Inspector General, DoD, must evaluate significant increases in BRAC MILCON project costs over the estimated costs provided to the Commission and send a report to the congressional Defense committees.

**Military Department BRAC Cost-Estimating Process.** To develop cost estimates for the Commission, the Military Departments used the Cost of Base Realignment Actions computer model. The Cost of Base Realignment Actions computer model uses standard cost factors to convert the suggested BRAC options into dollar values to provide a way to compare the different options. After the President and Congress approve the BRAC actions, DoD realigning activity officials prepare a DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data," for each individual MILCON project required to accomplish the realigning actions. The Cost of Base Realignment Actions computer model provides cost estimates as a realignment and closure package for a particular realigning or closing base. The DD Form 1391 provides specific cost estimates for an individual BRAC MILCON project.

**Limitations and Expansion to Overall Audit Scope.** Because the Cost of Base Realignment Actions computer model develops cost estimates as a BRAC package and not for individual BRAC MILCON projects, we were unable to determine the amount of cost increases for each individual BRAC MILCON

**Appendix C. Background of Defense Base Realignment and Closure and Scope of the Audit of FY 1997 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Costs**

---

project. Additionally, because of prior audit efforts that determined potential problems with all BRAC MILCON projects, our audit objectives included all large BRAC MILCON projects.

**Overall Audit Selection Process.** We reviewed the FY 1997 BRAC MILCON \$820.8 million budget submitted by the Military Departments and the Defense Logistics Agency. We excluded projects that were previously reviewed by DoD audit organizations. We grouped the remaining BRAC MILCON projects by location and selected groups of projects that totaled at least \$1 million for each group. We also reviewed those FY 1996 BRAC MILCON projects that were not included in the previous FY 1996 budget submission, but were added as part of the FY 1997 BRAC MILCON budget package.

---

## **Appendix D. Other Matters of Interest**

**Economic Analysis for Expansion.** The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) issued a memorandum on August 2, 1991, that requires the Military Departments to prepare an economic analysis for all military construction, major repairs, or renovation projects estimated to cost more than \$2 million. In addition, Naval Facilities Engineering Command Instruction 11010.44E, "Shore Facilities Planning Manual," December 15, 1987, requires organizations to prepare an economic analysis and include the analysis with the preliminary construction project documentation when alternatives to new construction exist.

**Project P-001T Economic Analysis.** An economic analysis for project P-001T was not required because the Commission directed the Navy to be realigned from leased space to existing Government space within the National Capital Region to include the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

## Appendix E. Projects Identified as Invalid or Partially Valid

**Table E-1. Causes of Invalid or Partially Valid Projects**

<u>Project Location</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Causes of Invalid Projects</u>		<u>Causes of Partially Valid Projects</u>	
		<u>Overstated</u>	<u>Unsupported</u>	<u>Overstated</u>	<u>Unsupported</u>
Headquarters Building Renovation	P-001T			X	X

**Table E-2. Recommended Changes in Project Estimates**

<u>Project Location</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Amount of Estimate on DD Form 1391 (thousands)</u>	<u>Recommended Amount of Change</u>	
			<u>Invalid Projects (thousands)</u>	<u>Partially Valid Projects (thousands)</u>
Headquarters Building Renovation	P-001T	<u>\$2,000</u>		\$2,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$2,000</b>		<b>\$2,000</b>

**Total Invalid and Partially Valid Projects** **\$2,000**

---

## **Appendix F. Organizations Visited or Contacted**

### **Office of the Secretary of Defense**

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Washington, DC

### **Department of the Navy**

Chief of Naval Operations, Washington, DC

Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Alexandria, VA

Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake, Washington, DC

---

## **Appendix G. Report Distribution**

### **Office of the Secretary of Defense**

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology  
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange  
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)  
Deputy Chief Financial Officer  
Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)  
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Industrial Affairs and Installations)  
Principal Assistant Deputy Secretary of Defense (Industrial Affairs and Installations)  
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)

### **Department of the Army**

Auditor General, Department of the Army

### **Department of the Navy**

Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller)  
Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Commander, Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake  
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

### **Department of the Air Force**

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)  
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

### **Other Defense Organizations**

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency  
Director, Defense Logistics Agency  
Director, National Security Agency  
Inspector General, National Security Agency  
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency

## **Non-Defense Federal Organizations and Individuals**

Office of Management and Budget  
Technical Information Center, National Security and International Affairs Division,  
General Accounting Office

Chairman and ranking minority member of each of the following congressional committees and subcommittees:

Senate Committee on Appropriations  
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations  
Senate Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations  
Senate Committee on Armed Services  
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs  
House Committee on Appropriations  
House Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations  
House Subcommittee on National Security, Committee on Appropriations  
House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight  
House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight  
House Committee on National Security

Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton, U.S. House of Representatives

This page was left out of original document



## **Part III - Management Comments**

# Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments



COMPTROLLER  
(Program/Budget)

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
1100 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1100



May 9, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDITING, DOD IG

SUBJECT: DoD IG Quick-Reaction Report on Defense Base Realignment and Closure  
for Realigning Elements of Headquarters, Department of the Navy, to the  
Washington Navy Yard (Project No. 6CG-5001.41)

This responds to your April 19, 1996, memorandum requesting our comments on the  
subject report.

The audit states that the Navy overstated the space requirements and costs for project  
P-001T, "Headquarters Building Renovation." The audit contends that this occurred because the  
Navy did not follow established Secretary of the Navy space allocation and cost guidance.

This audit recommends that the USD(Comptroller) place the funds for project  
P-001T on administrative withhold until the Navy submits a revised DD Form 1391 that accurately  
reflects requirements and costs.

The funding for project P-001T is included in the fiscal year 1997 Base Realignment and  
Closure (BRAC) budget request. We generally agree with the audit findings and recommendation;  
however, since the Navy has yet to comment on the audit and the amount of the savings has not  
been resolved, it is premature to take action at this time. However, if the issue is not resolved by  
the start of the fiscal year, we will place the funds associated with the project on administrative  
withhold pending resolution. Further, any savings resulting from the audit will be reprogrammed to  
other BRAC requirements as appropriate.

B. R. Paseur

Director for Construction

# Department of the Navy Comments



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY  
(INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT)  
1000 NAVY PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20350-1000

MAY 15 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ASSISTANT INSPECTOR  
GENERAL FOR AUDITING

Subj: DoDIG Draft Quick-Reaction Report on Defense Base  
Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realigning  
Elements of the Headquarters, Department of the Navy to  
the Washington Navy Yard (Project No. 6CG-5001.41)

I am responding to the draft quick-reaction audit report  
forwarded by Attachment 1, concerning base realignment and closure  
budget data for the realignment of elements of the Department of  
the Navy Headquarters to the Washington Navy Yard. Our response  
is provided at Attachment 2. We concur with draft audit  
recommendations.

  
ROBERT B. PIRIE, JR.

Attachments:

1. DoDIG memo of 19 Apr 96
2. DON Response to DoDIG Quick Reaction Report of 19 Apr 96

Copy to:

ASN(FMB)  
ASN(FMO-31)  
NAVINSGEN (02)  
COMNAVFACENGCOM (00G2)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY RESPONSE

TO

DODIG DRAFT QUICK REACTION REPORT OF 19 APRIL 1996  
ON  
DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE BUDGET DATA FOR REALIGNING  
ELEMENTS OF THE HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, TO THE  
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD  
(PROJECT 6CG-5001.41)

Project: P-001T  
Description: Headquarters Building Renovation  
Location: Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

Recommendation 1: We recommend that Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) place project P-001T, "Headquarters Building Renovation," on administrative withhold until the Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake submits a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Program," that accurately reflects requirements and costs.

Department of the Navy Response: Concur. The actual building loading/occupancy was not positively identified until December 1995. The Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake is currently reviewing the specific loading data, requirements calculations, and cost estimates to develop a revised DD Form 1391. A revised DD Form 1391 will be submitted by 14 June 1996.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the Commander, Engineering Field Activity-Chesapeake submit a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Program," for project P-001T, "Headquarters Building Renovation," that reflects accurately the Base Realignment and Closure requirements for accommodating transferring personnel as set forth in Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5910.7A, "Space and Facilities Management Procedures, National Capital Region (NCR)," April 22, 1993, and includes costs per square meter that are supportable by historical, architectural data, or the Military Handbook 1010A, "Cost Engineering: Policy and Procedures," August 1, 1992.

Department of the Navy Response: Concur. As stated in recommendation 1, the actual loading/occupancy was not positively identified until December 1995. A revised DD Form 1391 will be submitted by 14 June 1996, and will accurately reflect Base Realignment and Closure requirements for accommodating transferring personnel.

## **Audit Team Members**

This report was produced by the Contract Management Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD.

Paul J. Granetto  
Kimberley A. Caprio  
Kent E. Shaw  
Awanda A. Grimes  
William C. Coker  
Tara L. Queen

## INTERNET DOCUMENT INFORMATION FORM

**A . Report Title:** Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Realigning Elements of Headquarters, Department of the Navy, to the Washington Navy Yard

**B. DATE Report Downloaded From the Internet:** 12/01/99

**C. Report's Point of Contact: (Name, Organization, Address, Office Symbol, & Ph #):** OAIG-AUD (ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions)  
Inspector General, Department of Defense  
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)  
Arlington, VA 22202-2884

**D. Currently Applicable Classification Level:** Unclassified

**E. Distribution Statement A:** Approved for Public Release

**F. The foregoing information was compiled and provided by:**  
DTIC-OCA, Initials: \_\_VM\_\_ Preparation Date 12/01/99

The foregoing information should exactly correspond to the Title, Report Number, and the Date on the accompanying report document. If there are mismatches, or other questions, contact the above OCA Representative for resolution.